work done. I also have no control over the organisation of the production of *Sperling's Journal* or any other paper for which I do piecework. I am very glad that it is so, for organising production is a very difficult and complicated and risky business, and from all the risks of it the wage-earner is saved. The salary-earner or the professional, when once his product is turned out and paid for, also surrenders all claim upon the product. What else could any reasonable wage-earner or professional expect or desire ? The brickmaker or the doctor cannot, after being paid for making bricks or mending a broken leg, expect still to have the bricks or the leg for his very own. And how much use would they be to him if he could ? Unless he were to be allowed to sell them again to somebody else, which, after being once paid for them, would merely be absurd.

But when we come to the remedies that Mr Cole suggests for these " marks of degraded status/' we iind in the forefront of them that the worker must be secured " payment as a human being, and not merely as a mortal tenement of so much labour power for which an efficient demand exists/' This, especially to an incurably lazy person like myself, is an extremely attractive programme. To be paid, and paid well, merely in return for having " taken the trouble to be born/' is an ideal towards which my

happiest dreams have ever struggled in vain. But would it work as a practical scheme ? Speaking for myself, I can guarantee that under such circum-
stances *I* should potter about with many activities